



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/050,841 03/30/98 CALLAGHAN

P EN999017

 KPR

TM02/1102

EXAMINER

BLANCHE E SCHILLER
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY NY 12203-5160

EL TRAILER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED:

11/02/01

Final 827.030
Due 2/2/02


Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Final OA
DOCKETED 2/2/02

29 NOV 10 2002 34

--END-IPLAY--

Final Disp.
DOCKETED 5/2/02

T.R

Office Action SummaryApplication No.
09/050,841

Applicant(s)

Callaghan et al.

Examiner

Pierre E. Elisca

Group Art Unit

2161

 Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 4, 2001 This action is **FINAL**. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims Claim(s) 1-7, 9-27, and 29-52 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 8 and 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

 Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7, 9-27, and 29-52 is/are rejected. Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.**Application Papers** See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner. The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved. The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119** Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).**Attachment(s)** Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 2

Art Unit: 2161

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 09/04/2001.
2. Claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-52 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-4, 6, 7, 22-24, 26, 27, 42-46 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being by anticipated by Rosenberg (WO 98/09447) in view of Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis) (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,952).

A) Regarding to claim 1, Rosenberg discloses a method of sharing state information, said method comprising: determining state information to be shared between a first domain and a second domain see page 4, lines 18-23); and sharing said state information between said first domain and said second domain, wherein said first domain and said second domain

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 3

Art Unit: 2161

are non-cooperating domains, said non-cooperating domains having no knowledge of one another and wherein said non-cooperating domains do not directly communicate states information (see page 4, lines 18-27, page 7, lines 1-8 and lines 20-23 distinct domains). Rosenberg fails to disclose said sharing further comprises receiving, by an intermediary application, said request from a client prior to said adding, and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client prior to said adding and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application (see col. 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58., Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, receives request from server A and transmits information to server . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the method of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary applicant helps managing and tracking state information collected from the clients.

B) Regarding to claim 2, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 1., Rosenberg

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 4

Art Unit: 2161

further discloses said state information is stored within one or more cookies (see Fig. 2, item step 72 and page 7, lines 6-7).

C) Regarding to claim 3, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 1. Rosenberg further disclose said first domain and said second domain are disjoint domain (see page 4, lines 22-23).

D) Regarding to claim 4, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 1. Rosenberg further discloses said sharing comprises: adding state information of said first domain to a request to be sent to said second domain and sending said request, including said state information, to said second domain (see page 4, lines 18-27).

E) Regarding to claim 6, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing the state information as set forth in claim 1. Rosenberg further disclose said sharing comprises: adding state information of said first domain to a response associated with said second domain; and sending said response, including said state information, to a client (see page 4, lines 24-30).

F) Regarding to claim 7, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing the state information as set forth in claim 6. Rosenberg

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 5

Art Unit: 2161

further discloses said sharing further comprises saving said state information at said client, wherein said state information is saved for a specified range of Uniform Resource Locators associated (URL) with said second domain (see page 12, lines 8-10).

G) Regarding to claim 22, Rosenberg discloses a system of sharing state information, said system comprising:
means for determining state information to be shared between a first domain and a second domain (see page 4, lines 18-23); and means for sharing said state information between said first domain and said second domain, wherein said first domain and said second domain are non-cooperating domains, said non-cooperating domains having no knowledge of one another and wherein said non-cooperating domains do not directly communicate state information between one another (see page 4, lines 18-27, page 7, lines 1-8 and lines 20-23 distinct domains).

H) Regarding to claim 23, Rosenberg discloses the system of sharing state information as set forth in claim 22, Rosenberg further discloses said state information is stored within one or more cookies (see Fig. 2, item step 72 and page 7, lines 6-7).

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 6

Art Unit: 2161

I) Regarding to claim 24, Rosenberg discloses the system of sharing state information as set forth in claim 22. Rosenberg further discloses said means of sharing comprises: means for adding state information of said first domain to a request to be sent to said second domain and means for sending said request, including said state information, to said second domain (see page 4, lines 18-27).

J) Regarding to claim 26, Rosenberg discloses the system of sharing state information as set forth in claim 22. Rosenberg further discloses said means of sharing comprises: means for adding state information of said first domain to a response associated with said second domain and means for sending said response, including said state information, to a client (see page 4, lines 18-27).

K) Regarding to claim 27, Rosenberg discloses the system of sharing the state information as set forth in claim 26. Rosenberg further discloses said client is adapted to save said state information at said client, wherein said state information is saved for a specified range of Uniform Resource Locators associated (URL) with said second domain (see page 12, lines 8-10).

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 7

Art Unit: 2161

L) Regarding to claim 42, Rosenberg discloses an article of manufacture, comprising: at least one computer useable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing the sharing of state information, the computer readable program code means in said article of manufacture comprising: computer readable program code mean for causing a computer to determine state information to be shared between a first domain and a second domain (see page 4, lines 18-23); and computer readable program code means for causing a computer to share said state information between said first domain and said second domain, wherein said first domain and said second domain are non-cooperating domains, said non-cooperating domains having no knowledge of one another and wherein communicate state information between one another (see page 4, lines 18-27, page 7, lines 1-8 and lines 20-23, distinct domains).

M) Regarding to claim 43, Rosenberg discloses the article of manufacture of state information as set forth in claim 42. Rosenberg further discloses said state information is stored within one or more cookies (see Fig. 2, item step 72 and page 7, lines 6-7).

N) Regarding to claim 44, Rosenberg discloses the article of manufacture of state information as set forth in claim 42.

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 8

Art Unit: 2161

Rosenberg further discloses said computer readable program code means for causing a computer to share comprises: computer readable program code means for causing a computer to add state information of said first domain to a request to be sent to said second domain and computer readable program code means for causing a computer to send said request, including said state information, to said second domain (see page 4, lines 18-27, page 7, lines 1-8 and lines 20-23, cooperating server here refers to web site servers observing the common protocol. In the World Wide Web, it is inherently required that servers use the common protocol across distinct domain if information is to transfer from one server to the other, even servers across domain that are not cooperating to each other still needs to use common protocol in order to share information).

O) Regarding to claim 45, Rosenberg discloses the article of manufacture of state information as set forth in claim 42. Rosenberg further discloses said computer readable program code means for causing a computer to share comprises: computer readable program code means for causing a computer to add state information of said first domain to a response associated with said second domain; and computer readable program code means for causing a computer to send said response, including said state information, to a client (see page 4, lines 24-30).

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 9

Art Unit: 2161

P) Regarding to claim 46, Rosenberg discloses the article of manufacture of state information as set forth in claim 45. Rosenberg further discloses computer readable program code means for causing a computer to save said state information at said client, wherein said state information is saved for a specified range of Uniform Resource Locators associated (URL) with said second domain (see page 12, lines 8-10).

Claim Rejections - 33 U.S.C § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102, of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5, 10, 11-17, 25, 30-37, 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg (WO 98/09447) in

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841**Page 10****Art Unit: 2161**

view of Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis) (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,952).

A) Regarding to claim 5, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 4. Rosenberg fails to disclose said sharing further comprises receiving, by an intermediary application, said request from a client prior to said adding, and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client prior to said adding and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application (see col. 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58., Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, receives request from server A and transmits information to server B. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the method of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary applicant helps managing and tracking state information collected from the clients.

B) Regarding to claim 10, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing state information, said method comprising: determining state information to be provided to at least one of a client application and a server application (see Fig. 7); and

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 11

Art Unit: 2161

Rosenberg fails to disclose using an intermediary application to provide said state information to at least one of said client application and said server application. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client application (server A) prior to said adding and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application (see Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, between server A and server B, col. 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the method of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary application helps managing and tracking information gather from the clients.

C) Regarding to claim 11, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 10. Rosenberg fails to disclose receiving, by said intermediary application, a request from said client; and sending a response to said request from said intermediary application to said client, said response including said state information. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client and sending a response to said request from said intermediary application to said client, said response including said state information. are performed by said intermediary

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 12

Art Unit: 2161

application (see col. 4, lines 51-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the method of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary application helps managing and track state information gathered from the clients.

D) Regarding to claim 12, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 10 above. Rosenberg further disclose said state information is provided to said client and wherein said method further comprises saving said state information at said client for any specified range of Uniform Resource Locators (see page 4, lines 24-30 and page 12, lines 8-10).

E) Regarding to claim 13, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 12 above. Rosenberg further fails to disclose said state information saved at said client to said intermediary application. However, Davis discloses said state information track at said client automatically sends the information acquired from the client back to a server for storage and analysis (see col. 4, lines 37-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davis's

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 13

Art Unit: 2161

intermediary application with Rosenberg's method of tracking state information. One would have been motivated to do so because it would help better managing and tracking state information gathered from the clients.

F) Regarding to claim 14, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 12 above. Rosenberg further discloses saving said state information for one or more other range of Uniform Resource Locators (see col. 12, lines 8-16).

G) Regarding to claim 15, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the method of providing state information as set forth in claim 10 above. Rosenberg further discloses adding said state information to a request for said server (see page 4, lines 23-24).

H) Regarding to claim 16, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the method of providing state information as set forth in claim 10 above. Rosenberg further discloses in Prior Art section adding state information to a response for said client (see page 3, line 19-20).

I) Regarding to claim 17, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the method of providing state information as set forth in claim 10

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 14

Art Unit: 2161

above. Rosenberg further discloses saving, by said client, said state information for a specified range of Uniform Resource Locators (see page 12, lines 8-10).

J) Regarding to claim 25, Rosenberg discloses the system of sharing state information as set forth in claim 24. Rosenberg fails to disclose said sharing further comprising an intermediary application adapted to receive said request from a client prior to said adding, and adapted to add said state information to said request and to send said request. However, Davis discloses intermediary application adapted to receive said request from a client prior to said adding, and adapted to add said state information to said request and to send said request (see col. 4, lines 3740 and lines 55-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the system means of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary applicant would helps managing and tracking state information collected from the clients.

K) Regarding to claim 30, Rosenberg discloses the system of sharing state information, said system comprising:

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 15

Art Unit: 2161

means for determining state information to be provided to at least one of a client and a server (see Fig. 7); and Rosenberg fails to disclose an intermediary application adapted to provide said state information to at least one of said client and said server. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application adapted to provide said state information to at least one of said client and server (see Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, between server A and server B, col. 4, lines 3740 and lines 55-58, col. 4, lines 51-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the system means of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary application helps managing and tracking information gather from the clients.

L) Regarding to claim 31, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the system of sharing state information as set forth in claim 30. Rosenberg fails to disclose receiving a request from said client; and sending a response to said client, said response including said state information. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client and sending a response to said request to the client (see col. 4, lines 51-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 16

Art Unit: 2161

application of Davis with the system means of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary application helps managing and track state information gathered from the clients.

M) Regarding to claim 32, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 12 and therefore the same rejection applied.

P) Regarding to claim 33, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 13 and therefore the same rejection applied.

N) Regarding to claim 34, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 14 and therefore the same rejection applied.

O) Regarding to claim 35, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 15 and therefore the same rejection applied.

P) Regarding to claim 36, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 16 and therefore the same rejection applied.

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 17

Art Unit: 2161

Q) Regarding to claim 37, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 17 and therefore the same rejection applied.

R) Regarding to claim 47, Rosenberg discloses an article of manufacture comprising:

at least one computer useable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing the providing of state information, the computer readable program code means in said article of manufacture comprising:

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to determine state information to be provided to at least one of a client application (client) and a server application (server) (see page 7, lines 10-24);

Rosenberg fails to disclose a computer readable program means for causing a computer to use an intermediary application to provide said state information to at least one of said client and said server. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client (see Fig. 5, server A) prior to said adding and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application (see Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, between server A and server B, col. 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58 col. 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 18

Art Unit: 2161

time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the method of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary application helps managing and tracking information gather from the clients.

S) Regarding to claim 48, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses an article of manufacture, comprising state information as set forth in claim 47. Rosenberg further discloses said state information is provided to said client and wherein said article of manufacture further comprises computer readable program code means for causing a computer to save said state information at said client for any specified range of Uniform Resource Locators (see page 4, lines 24-30 and page 12, lines 8-10).

T) Regarding to claim 49, Rosenberg in view of Davis discloses the article of manufacture of state information as set forth in claim 48, Rosenberg further discloses a computer readable program code means for causing a computer to save said state information for one or more other range of Uniform Resource Locators (see col. 12, lines 8-16).

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 19

Art Unit: 2161

9. Claim 9 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg (WO 98/09447) in view of Susuki et al. (U.S. 5,946,665).

A) Regarding to claim 9, Rosenberg discloses the method of sharing state information as set forth in claim 1. Rosenberg further discloses said sharing said state information is representative of at least one of the following:

- a) login credentials to be used when accessing said first domain and said second domain (see Fig. 7). Rosenberg fails to disclose:
- b) items to be purchased in an on-line virtual shopping mall, wherein said first domain represents a first vendor of said on-line virtual shopping mall and said second domain represents a second vendor of said on-line virtual shopping mall. However, Suzuki disclose items to be purchased in an on-line virtual shopping mall, wherein said first domain represents a first vendor of said on-line virtual shopping mall and said second domain represents a second vendor of said on-line virtual mall (see Fig. 11, item 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the virtual shopping mall of Susuki with the sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would have been motivated to do so because sharing, state information can help vendors keeping track of consumer's on-line shopping that leads to purchases (i.e. shopping cart where

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 20

Art Unit: 2161

shoppers browse through the virtual stores and items picked are collected in the shopping cart).

B) Regarding to claim 29, the claimed invention has the same limitations as claim 9 and therefore the same rejection applied.

10. Claims 20 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Giacoppo ("http://www.dejanews.com", Forum: comp.lang.java.announce, Thread: ad/soft/Checkout -shopping cart applet, 8/8/97) in view of Krick ("A cookie for your thoughts: cookies help Webmasters harness user habits. (Internet /Web/Online Service Information) (Tutorial)", Computer Shopper, v17, n7, p610(1)).

A) Regarding to claim 20, Giacoppo discloses an electronic shopping method as set forth in claim 19. Giacoppo did not disclose said shared shopping cart comprises one or more cookies representing said plurality of items to be purchased. However, Krick discloses one or more cookies representing said plurality of items to be purchased (see page 2, lines 47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the use of cookie of Krick with the electronic shopping method of Giacoppo. One would be motivated to do so because cookies helps keep track of shoppers' selected

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 21

Art Unit: 2161

items as they browse and stored in the shopping cart until they are ready to purchase.

B) Regarding to claim 40, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 20 and therefore the same rejection applied.

11. Claims 21 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giacoppo ("<http://www.dejanews.com>", Forum: comp.lang.java.announce, Thread: ad/soft/Checkout -shopping cart applet, 8/8/97) in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,952).

A) Regarding to claim 21, Giacoppo discloses an electronic shopping method as set forth in claim 19. Giacoppo did not disclose said placing is controlled by an intermediary application coupled to said web sites. However, Davis discloses said placing is controlled by an intermediary application that monitor client's activity on-line (see col. 4, lines 50-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with Giacoppo's electronic shopping method. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary applicant would help managing the shopping history for the shoppers.

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 22

Art Unit: 2161

B) Regarding to claim 41, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 21 and therefore the same rejection applied.

12. Claims 18, 19, 38 are rejected under 35 U. S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Giacoppo ("http://www.dejanews.com", Forum: comp.lang.java.announce, Thread: ad/soft/CheckOut -shopping cart applet, 8/8/97) in view of Davis.

A) Regarding to claim 18, Giacoppo discloses a method of electronic shopping, said method comprising: selecting, by purchaser, a plurality of items to be purchased electronically from a plurality of vendors, said plurality of vendors being represented by plurality of web sites; and purchasing said plurality of items on-line via a single check out wherein an indication of said plurality of items to be purchased need not be moved, by said purchaser, between said plurality of vendors (see page 1 and 2, when purchasing items in a virtual mall with a single checkout, it is inherent that purchasing list is tracked by shopping cart (cookie program) and stored in a destinated database until shoppers ready for checkout. page 2, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-6 teaches that destinated server can be any server on the Internet which includes a third trusted party

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 23

Art Unit: 2161

(intermediate application or proxy server), therefore the limitation is met).

Giacoppo does not explicitly discloses said plurality of vendors comprising a plurality of non-cooperating domains, said non-cooperating domains having no knowledge of one another and wherein said non-cooperating domains do not directly communicate state information between another.

However, third party acting as host to offer as proxy service or clearinghouse for plurality of website where each website has no knowledge of one another is common in the Internet art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Giacoppo's system with plurality of vendors where each vendors are not do not directly communicate state information with one another so that each vendor only need to deal with one central party instead of multiple parties.

Giacoppo does not disclosed an intermediary application. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client prior to said adding and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application (see col. 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58., Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, receives request from server A and transmits information to server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 24

Art Unit: 2161

application of Davis with the method of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary applicant helps managing and tracking state information collected from the clients.

B) Regarding to claim 19, Giacoppo discloses an electronic shopping method as set forth in claim 18. Giacoppo further discloses said electronic shopping comprising placing said selected plurality of items in a shared shopping cart, said shared shopping cart being shared between said plurality of vendors (see pages 1 and 2).

C) Regarding to claim 38, Giacoppo discloses a system of electronic shopping, said system comprising: means for selecting, by a purchaser, a plurality of items to be purchased electronically from a plurality of vendors, said plurality of vendors being represented by plurality of web sites; and means for purchasing said plurality of items on-line via a single check out, wherein an indication of said plurality of items to be purchased need not be moved by said purchaser, between said plurality of vendors (see page 1 and 2, when purchasing items in a virtual mall with a single checkout, it is inherent that purchasing list is tracked by shopping cart (cookie program) and stored in a destinated database

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841**Page 25****Art Unit: 2161**

until shoppers ready for checkout. Page 2, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-6 teaches that: destinated server can be any server on the Internet which includes a third trusted party (intermediate application or proxy server), therefore the limitation is met).

Giacoppo does not explicitly discloses said plurality of vendors comprising a plurality of non-cooperating domains, said non-cooperating domains having no knowledge of one another and wherein said non-cooperating domains do not directly communicate state information between another.

However, third party acting as host to offer as proxy service or clearinghouse for plurality of website where each website has no knowledge of one another is common in the Internet art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Giacoppo's system with plurality of vendors where each vendors are not do not directly communicate state information with one another so that each vendor only need to deal with one central party instead of multiple parties.

Giacoppo does not disclosed an intermediary application. However, Davis discloses an intermediary application receive said request from a client prior to said adding and wherein said adding and said sending are performed by said intermediary application (see col. 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58., Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, receives request from server A and transmits information to

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 26

Art Unit: 2161

server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the intermediary application of Davis with the method of sharing state information of Rosenberg. One would be motivated to do so because the intermediary applicant helps managing and tracking state information collected from the clients.

D) Regarding to claim 39, the claimed invention has the similar limitations as claim 19 and therefore the same rejection applied.

E) Regarding to claim 50, Giacoppo at least one program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying at least one program of instructions executable by machine to perform a method of electronic shopping, said method comprising:

selecting, by a purchaser, a plurality of items to be purchased electronically from a plurality of vendors, said plurality of vendors being represented by plurality of web sites (see pages 1-2); and

purchasing said plurality of items on-line via a single check out, wherein an indication of said plurality of items to be purchased need not be moved, by said purchaser, between said plurality of vendors (see page I and 2, when purchasing items in a virtual mall

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 27

Art Unit: 2161

with a single checkout, it is inherent that purchasing list is tracked by shopping cart (cookie program) and stored in a destinated database until shoppers ready for checkout. page 2, 2rd paragraph, lines 3-6 teaches that destinated server can be any server on the Internet which includes a third trusted party (intermediate application or proxy server), therefore the limitation is met).

Giacoppo does not explicitly discloses said plurality of vendors comprising a plurality of non-cooperating domains, said non-cooperating domains having no knowledge of one another and wherein said non-cooperating domains do not directly communicate state information between another.

However, third party acting as host to offer as proxy service or clearinghouse for plurality of website where each website has no knowledge of one another is common in the Internet art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Giacoppo's system with plurality of vendors where each vendors are not do not directly communicate state information with one another so that each vendor only need to deal with one central party instead of multiple parties.

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 28

Art Unit: 2161

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/04/2001 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground (s) of rejection.

REMARK

14. The newly added limitation ¶ an intermediary application is disclosed by Davis in col 4, lines 37-40 and lines 55-58., Fig. 5, intermediate application, client, receives request from server A and transmits information to server B.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 29

Art Unit: 2161

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231
or faxed to:

(703) 305-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-0040, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre Eddy Elisca, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3987 and whose e-mail address is Pierre.Elisca@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768. The fax phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-0040.

The Official Fax Numbers for TC-2100

After-final (703) 746-7238

Official (703) 746-7239

Application/Control Number: 09/050,841

Page 30

Art Unit: 2161

Non-Official/Draft (703) 746-7240

Pierre Eddy Elisca

Patent Examiner (Art Unit 2161)

October 29, 2001

Attachment for PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier)
6/18/01

The below text replaces the pre-printed text under the heading, "Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes," on the back of the PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier) form.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

1. Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85

New corrected drawings must be filed with the changes incorporated therein. Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin. If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTO-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the Notice of Allowability. Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability. The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

2. Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made, other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit the drawing corrections within the time period set in the attached Office communication. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.